

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

KHANH M. LE,

Plaintiff,

v.

SACRAMENTO COUNTY SHERIFF, et  
al.,

Defendants.

CASE NO. C13-694MJP

ORDER OF DISMISSAL

This matter comes before the Court on the motion to dismiss filed by the County of Sacramento and the Sacramento County Sheriff. (Dkt. No. 21.) Having reviewed the motion, Plaintiff's response (Dkt. No. 32), and the remaining record, the Court GRANTS the motion and orders that this action is DISMISSED with prejudice.

In their motion, the Sacramento County Defendants assert a number of defenses, including lack of personal jurisdiction and failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted. (Dkt. No. 21 at 2-5); see also Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(2), Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6). Plaintiff's response contains no substantive argument, and states only that he "object[]s to the


1 Defendants' motion to dismiss my complaint" and "request[s] that the Court deny the motion."  
2 (Dkt. No. 32 at 1.) Plaintiff does not address any of the arguments raised by Defendants in their  
3 motion. (Id.)

4 Plaintiff's failure to address any of the grounds for dismissal raised by Defendants in  
5 their motion is tantamount to a failure to file a response. This Court's Local Rules explain that  
6 failure to file opposition to a motion "may be considered by the court as an admission that the  
7 motion has merit." Local Rules W.D. Wash. LCR 7(b)(2). Because Plaintiff's opposition failed  
8 to substantively respond to Defendants' motion, the Court considers this an admission that the  
9 motion has merit, and therefore GRANTS the motion.

10 Defendant's motion to dismiss is GRANTED and this action is hereby DISMISSED with  
11 prejudice.

12 The clerk is ordered to provide copies of this order to Plaintiff and to all counsel.

13 Dated this 28th day of August, 2013.

14  
15  
16   
17 Marsha J. Pechman  
United States District Judge  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24